

does the claim come from, who manage it, what resources do they have, and what interests do they represent? Storylines create meaning and mobilize action... Consent of the population is internalized by *framing* the debate in a particular way and suppressing opposing *framings*, which both use and construct (Murphy, 2010: 21-22).

### 3. Three phases of a SM mobilization

The first and the most world-wide phase I call a ‘usual’. It depends on political and social opportunity structure (Tarrow, 1988, 2005). In Russia from early 1990s onwards, this structure gradually shrank, and finally became hostile to the majority of Russian SMs except so called pro-Kremlin SMs. Nowadays, these movements exist and used to practice in the hostile political context (Yanitsky, 1999, 2010). The second phase of a SM mobilization can be labeled as ‘targeted’ or planned when something extra-ordinary already happened in a particular place, be it a natural disaster or man-made accident. This phase is characterized by mobilization resources at hand plus, if necessary, by the attraction some sister movements or organizations (say, local grassroots or charity organizations). The third phase I call a ‘critical’ (extreme) case when all accessible resources should be mobilized.

Accordingly, the first case could be labeled as a limited mobilization because it presents a particular SM’s response to usual and long-term hostile context pressure. A limited mobilization means that the SMOs leaders mobilizes resources *at hand*, that is, the mobilization of any extra-efforts are not needed. Their already accumulated knowledge and experience (action repertoire) is well enough for coping with the particular accident.

The second case may be depicted as targeted mobilization of a particular SM and his sister organization’s resources for mitigation of a given disaster. And the third case presents all-embraced mobilization of a global civil society (or at least of its concerned majority) for coping with the large-scale natural or man-made catastrophe. Or as it happened quite recently, it presents the all-embracing civil society response to a new challenge such as global warming. In this latter case SMs of various kinds could united in an alter-global social movement.

It is quite natural that whilst in the first phase the process of resources mobilization presents a routine work (gathering information, mapping local re-

sources, attempts to widen its constituency, etc.), in the latter phase all possible resources, be it at hand or distanced should be find out and mobilized.

Besides, I would stress that in all above cases the resources of civil society organizations are usually not ‘stored’ and ready to use as in the case of governmental rescue organizations, but they should be find out or mainly produced by civic organizations themselves. These search for or self-production of resources means the critical change of their habitual way of life. First of all it related to established order of man—nature relations. That is why, U.Beck said: ‘The hardcore sociological question is: Where is the support for ecological changes supposed to come from, the support which in many cases would undermine their lifestyles, their consumption habits, their social status and life conditions in what are already truly very uncertain times?’ (Beck, 2010: 2).

#### **4. Framing the issue and changing the sense and structure of a SM**

Though as I mentioned earlier, recently nearly all Russian SMs are in the first phase of mobilization, every disaster needs its own set of frames: master frame, motivation, mobilization, etc. To my mind, the master frame is the same that of worldview or general disposition. It should answer to the key question: why we, the SM and its activists and allies, should be mobilized? In our case (forest, steppe and peat fires) the master frame is ‘People and nature in calamity - they needs our aid!’, Motivation frame: ‘We are needed because nobody can help them but ourselves’, Mobilization frames: ‘They need help immediately!’ and ‘All who can do it, united!’ Literally speaking, the 2010 Summer mobilization can be called as the short-term ‘The International Alliance of Civil Rescuers’, which above all, activates the ‘sleeping’ resources and networks of the environmental, charity, local lore and other social movements and grassroots.

It is quite natural that the focal point of all activities of all SMs involved is a rescue operations of those who have been affected by a disaster. It was massive action, but of spot-like and not a protest character. The key limits of rescue activity were time and resistance of local residents who did not want to leave their long-occupied places. Hence, not a socio-ecological *conflict* become a focal point of a SM’s activity, but *a field* of required help. It means that a SM activity has not defensive of offensive (if not militant), bun *humanitarian* character. The hot summer of 2010 discrowns the myth cultivated